1:Nimuendajú E-5 (1941-1942) 1952
SQ20 Tucuna SQ20

APPENDIX B

Linguistic Classification

Rivet describes Tukuna as "un dialecte arawak très corrompu" and cites numerous lexicological examples in support. Of these, however, some do not seem to me to be valid, principally because of the deficient phonetic reproduction of Tukuna in the vocabularies which Rivet had at his disposal. 197 114

Nothing can be proved with such examples as the following:

	Tukuna	Arawak	Uainumá
mouth	a	hai, hei, ya, ye (tooth)	
water	dï'a'		
	dï-dɨ̈	čia' (river)	
earth	guain		
	va[']mɨ" (va-, black; mɨ", mass)		ga'han

In Uainumá the word does not even appear to be composed in the same way (ča'riri, black). However, in spite of these qualifications, the Tukuna vocabulary undoubtedly has a number of borrowed elements from the Arawak languages, as Brinton and Tessmann have also recognized. Among the thirty-eight word stems which Tessmann offers, it appears to me that there are nine—not only six—which have their Arawakan equivalents.

The Tupí influence is greater than Rivet supposes, even disregarding certain equivalents, such as the following:

	Tukuna	Tupí
drink (v.)	aï'	au'

when the stem is u and the pronominal prefix of the first person singular is a-. Or:

	Tukuna	Tupí	Guaraní
branch	ča'kɨ̈ (?)	šakae	tacang

It also appears in the pronouns, which Rivet correctly noted but did not take into consideration in his table. The similarities with Yurí are fewer, but not less in importance, and it is regrettable that we lack phonetically written vocabularies of this language; I myself did not find anyone who still spoke it.

The Tukáno element, which Tessmann cites as the second influence, is very weak, as Rivet noticed also. As for the Múra, which Loukotka mentions as a component of Tukuna, I have found no certain vestiges.

There is, however, another element in Tukuna—the Gê, to which Martius has drawn attention, listing eleven examples, which Rivet increased to sixteen. We note also that both authors include in the Gê family the Kamakã' and the Maxakarí. In order to present in an orderly fashion all the material we have on the various languages in question, I list below Rivet's sixteen Gê equivalents. All are given in my own phonetic orthography except words for which I have no corresponding terms; these are given in Rivet's orthography, with quotation marks.

English	Tukuna	Equivalents
1. hair	dya'ũ	da-zai' (ẽerénte; ẽavánte) "aĩ" (Maxakarí)
2. to run	aya	aya:'ai (Kamakã' [Kotoxó])

1:Nimuendajú E-5 (1941-1942) 1952
SQ20 Tucuna SQ20

English	Tukuna	Equivalents
3. caiman	kɔ'ya	kuihỹ' (Šerénte; šavínte)
4. water	dõa'; dõ^{ẽ}ỹ	"kedochiã" (Kotoxó), river
		tsa^{a}-kɨ'wa:' (? Kamakã)
5. woman	ãõ	nyenaxkwa:' (Kamakã [Kotoxó]), girl
		niela (Kamakã' [Kotoxó]), woman (not listed by Rivet)
		ndi (Rąmkõ'kamekra [Krahó]), vulva
6. fire	ỹĩ'	čaxkɨ' (Kamakã' [Kotoxó])
7. a tough gram (cospim)	maĩ'	"mahe-ky" (Corôado), maize
		"mmky" (Puri), maize
8. maize	čavỹ'	čy'i (Maŝakari, etc.)
9. shinbone	para	pa:'ri (Apinayé), foot
		pa:'ri (Apąnyekra), foot
		"t'cha-perrê" (Corôado), foot
10. rice	avatiỹ'	wonsi' (Suyá), maize
		awati'-(both branches of the Tupí)
11. nail	pa'tỹ	pata' (Maŝakari, etc.), foot
		pa-tê (Apąnyekra), our shinbone
		"ni-pata" (Kotoxó), bone (Kamakã': dionče = bone)
12. foot	kutỹ	"bathaja-ko'to" (Apąnyekra), calf of leg (?)
		"guang-gathie'" (Kamakã'), femur [? tąę, leg]
13. branch	ča'kỹ	pą-či (Maŝakari, etc.), thigh; [kotóy = toe]
14. sun	jakỹ'	pi^{a}-yale', (Rąmkõ'kamekra [Apąnyekra]), root
15. earth	vaỹ'mỹ^{a}	čaxkɨ' (Kamakã', etc.)
		"hâme" (Koropó)
16. head	ẽ'ru	haha'm (Maŝakari, etc.; Patašó)
		hąro' (Kamakã', etc.)

No. 10 is erroneously classified. Nos. 4, 6, 12, and 15 compare radically dissimilar forms. Nos. 7, 11, and 13 are words with quite different meanings (nail = foot = shinbone). In Nos. 3, 8, and 14, perhaps also in No. 1, the resemblance is pretty vague. That leaves us:

	Tukuna		
2. run	aya:	aya:'ni (Kamakã')	nyani (Guaraní)
5. woman	ãõ	niela (Kamakã')	
9. shinbone	para	pa:'ri(Timbira-Kayapó)	pra (šerénte, foot; plural, pe)
16. head	ẽ'ru	hąro' (Kamakã')	

And we can also add:

good	mã	mpã (Timbira)	mã (Kapayó)

This is very little; and furthermore, the five, or rather eight, resemblances embrace three distinct linguistic families of eastern Brazil: Gê (4 equivalents), Kamakã' (3 equivalents), Tupí-Guaraní (1 equivalent). However, I do not think that these resemblances are entirely fortuitous, even though I can offer no acceptable explanation of them. The hypothesis which Rivet admits as most probable, i.e., that "certaines dialectes gês ont emprunté a l'arawak des radicaux nombreux," is useless because only one of the words compared is also found in the Arawak languages, which evidently cannot have been the transmitters. In this context it is well to remember that Gê elements also appear in certain languages of the upper

1:Nimuendajú E-5 (1941-1942) 1952
SQ20 Tucuna SQ20

Madeira: a few are found in the languages of the Capakúra family, and they are a little more evident in the isolated language of the Jabutí (and Arikapú) of the upper Rio Branco, tributary to the Guaporé, discovered and reported on by H. Snethlage in 1933.

The grammatical characteristics of Tukuna are the following: one article, na (which is placed before the substantive), different from the personal pronoun of the third person, na; two plural suffixes of substantives, *-ta* and *-gi;* and a suffix, *-ɛ*, of the plural of verbs. There are distinct forms for the singular and plural of both transitive and intransitive verbs, viz.:

to go (one person) uⁿ
to go (several persons) iⁿ

to kill (one person) ma/
to kill (several persons) da'i

The Tukuna forms for the first person singular (masc.) and the first person plural (masc.) of certain pronouns correspond to the Tupí, as well as the Yurí, forms. These are:

First person singular (mas.) ʒa
First person plural (mas.) ta

(Omágua: tana = us, exclusively.) For the Tukuna pronoun of the second person singular, ku, I have found no corresponding form in any language (unless it be the Uro, eun ?). The personal pronouns (demonstrative) of the third person are the most distinctive characteristic of the Tukuna language. In addition to the distinction of gender, which is expressed only in them, many of these pronouns convey also a local and temporal meaning. I do not know of a similar process in any other language.

This distinction of gender in the third person of the pronouns (as well as in the substantives) is certainly one of the best criteria of the Arawakan languages, but it is lacking precisely in the Arawakan language immediately next to Tukuna, viz., Kayuišána, while it appears in the non-Arawakan languages of the region—Witóto, Miránya, and Tukáno. Nor do there appear to be other grammatical affinities between Tukuna and the Arawakan languages. Since the Tukuna lexical elements do not represent an appreciable percentage of the Arawakan languages, I do not believe that there is sufficient ground for including Tukuna in the Arawak family, as Brinton, Rivet, and Loukotka have done. It is preferable to consider it, for the time being, as Chamberlain and Tessmann do, an isolated language.

2: Nimuendajú E-5 (1941-1942) 1948
SQ20 Tucuna SQ20

THE TUCUNA

By Curt Nimuendaju

HABITAT, HISTORY, AND LANGUAGE

The *Tucuna* (*Tukuna, Ticuna*), not to be confused with the *Tucano*, occupied the jungle tracts of the tributaries of the northern side of the Amazon-Solimões River from long. 71°15′ (Peruaté Island) to 68° 40′ W., and the upper course of the streams on the opposite side of the watershed of the Putumayo-Içá River (map 1, *No. 4;* map 5). They avoided the banks of the Amazon-Solimões, fearing the *Omagua*, their traditional enemies of the islands. When the latter disappeared, the *Tucuna* spread out over the islands and shores of the Solimões as far as the Auatí-Paraná River (long. 66°30′ W.).

The country is flat, covered by Amazonian jungle. A wide strip bordering on the Solimões River is subject to great periodical floods.

The *Tucuna*, inconspicuous in the history of the Amazon, were first mentioned in 1641 by Cristobal d'Acuña.

Rivet (1912 b) designated the *Tucuna* language as "un dialecte arawak très corrompu." Only a part of his list of lexicological similarities appears to be valid, especially as he lacked sufficient reference material on the *Tucuna* language. There is, however, no doubt that the *Tucunan* vocabulary has a number of elements which were borrowed from the *Arawakan* languages, as noted also by Brinton (1901) and Tessmann (1930). *Tupí* influence is greater than Rivet supposed, being revealed in the pronouns, which he noted but did not evaluate. Correspondences with *Yurí* are fewer, but not unimportant. It is regrettable that there is not more phonetic material on this language. The *Tucanan* element, which Tessmann states is second in importance, is, as Rivet also noted, very weak. The *Mura* element postulated by Loukotka lacks absolute proof.

Martius called attention to 11 *Ge* elements in *Tucunan;* Rivet added five more examples. (Both Martius and Rivet include *Camacán* and *Masacarian* in the *Ge* family.) But, of Rivet's 16 *Ge* elements, only 4 are valid, 3 being formed of *Camacán* elements and only one of *Ge* elements.

There is, therefore, insufficient evidence for Brinton's, Rivet's, and Loukotka's inclusion of *Tucunan* in the *Arawakan* family. For the present, it is advisable to follow Chamberlain and Tessmann in considering it a separate language.